UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,808	05/12/2005	Alexis S R Ashley	GB 020193	5610

24737 7590 02/26/2009
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
CHAI, LONGBIT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2431	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory

1. As per claim 1 and 9, Applicant asserts (a) nothing in Koike teaches or suggests the Terminal Device and the Privacy Data Administrator are a "complete set of the receiver" (Remarks: Page 6 / 2nd Para / Line 6 – 8) (b) This privacy data administrator administrating data including privacy of the user (not the receiver) (Remarks: Page 6 / 1st Para / Line 4 – 5) and (c) Koike does not teach that the privacy policy identifying the usage data sought to be harvested and an intended use for the usage data is provided to the receiver or terminal, but is administered by a device between the server and receiver (Remarks: Page 5 / 4th Para / Line 7 – 10). Examiner respectfully disagrees with the following rationale.

   - Regarding (a), Applicant's argument has no merit since the alleged limitation has not been recited into the claim. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). This is because the claim limitation "at the receiver selecting from the store the usage data identified in the privacy policy", as recited in the claim, does not particularly point-out the usage data is the receiver's usage data and instead, merely recites "the usage data identified in the privacy policy". On this regard, Koike teaches provide / transmit the privacy usage data of the user to the server upon the successful comparison between the privacy policy of the server and the privacy preference of the user (Koike: Para [0021] Line 7 – 10, Para [0032] Line 3 – 4 and Para [0036]).

   - Regarding (b) and (c), likewise, the claim language does not particularly recite the receiver must be the receiver of the end terminal device and Koike teaches a first

unit of the privacy data administrator acquiring a privacy policy from the server and transmit the privacy usage data of the user to the server upon the successful comparison between the privacy policy of the server and the privacy preference of the user (Koike: Para [0036], Para [0021] Line 7 – 10 and Para [0032] Line 3 – 4).

- Furthermore, as a reminder to Applicant, there is another ***35 USC § 102 rejection*** with prior-art reference, namely, Nilsson et al. (U.S. Patent 2003/0041100) as set forth in the section of 102(e) Rejection of the Final Office action (submitted on 12/16/2008: Page 6 – 8) indicates that Nilsson teaches "if ***the user*** **or** user agent accepts the origin servers privacy policy, the CPI may be transmitted to the origin server (Nilsson: Para [0015] Line 6 – 8: Examiner note the user receives and accepts the origin servers privacy policy) and only minimal privacy information is provided to the origin server about a user (Nilsson: Para [0014] Last sentence: minimal privacy information meets the "usage data" in the claim) and as such Applicant's arguments are respectfully traversed.